

State of California

THOMAS J. NUSSBAUM
Chancellor

ROSEMARY E. THAKAR
President, Board of Governors



DELAINÉ EASTIN
Superintendent of Public Instruction

MONICA LOZANO
President, State Board of Education

California Community Colleges
1102 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-3607

California Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall; P. O. Box 944272
Sacramento, CA 94244-2720

Phillip J. Forhan
Carlton J. Jenkins
Linda Griego
Lozano
Irene M. Menegas

Monica

MEETING NOTES

Joint Advisory Committee on Vocational Education
Wednesday, May 17, 2000
California Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall, Executive Conference Room
Sacramento, CA 95814

JAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Board of Governors
Irene Menegas

State Board of Education
Monica Lozano

STAFF PRESENT:

Patrick Ainsworth (CDE)
Bill Anderson (PACE)
Cindy Beck (CDE)
Beverly Campbell (CDE)
Robert Dillman (PACE)
Jerry Hayward (PACE)
Ed King (CDE)
Mary Ann Kloss (COCCC)
Rick Mejia (CDE)
Victoria Morrow (COCCC)

Lee Murdock (COCCC)
Ken Nather (COCCC)
Bernie Norton (CDE)
Peggy Olivier (COCCC)
Chuck Parker (CDE)
Teresa Parkison (COCCC)
Julie Parr (CDE)
Melanie Schultz-Miller (COCCC)
Dennis Turner (CDE)
Chris Yatooma (COCCC)

OTHERS PRESENT:

Patricia de Cos
Susan O'Donnell

Wolfgang Von Sydow

CALL TO ORDER:

Monica Lozano called the meeting of the Joint Advisory Committee on Vocational Education to order at 10:00 am.

INTRODUCTIONS:

Ms. Lozano thanked everyone for attending the meeting and then asked for self-introductions.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of the February 23, 2000 JAC meeting were reviewed. Approval of the minutes were delayed until the next meeting.

ITEM 1 - DRAFT MOU:

Patrick Ainsworth distributed a copy of the draft Memorandum of Understanding between the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and reported that staff from CDE and COCCC have met to revise and update the MOU. The MOU is traditionally revised with each new State Plan and serves as the basis for collaboration and cooperation between the two state agencies in administering federal vocational education funds. Mr. Ainsworth reviewed Section III which describes a new environment of shared planning and coordination between the two agencies.

Suggestions for changes included:

- Add an effective date for the MOU to coincide with approval by both Boards.
- In the Introduction, change wording to show the cooperation between the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors instead of between the two state agencies.
- Under Section I-C, expand the information on notification of public meetings. Suggest sending out a "save the date" flyer to LEAs one month prior to meeting, and then distribute the formal Public Meeting Notice ten days prior to the meeting.
- Under Section I-C, change the Brown Open Meeting Act to the Bagley Keene Open Meeting Act.
- Under Section III, include more information on the joint management team to show how it is formed and who is on it. Show title and functions of members, not names.

The MOU will need to be reviewed and approved by the JAC and then by both Boards. In order to save time, the MOU should be submitted to both Boards as an information item during their next meetings. After the MOU is approved by the JAC at it's July meeting, it can be forwarded to both Boards as an action item at the meeting that follows.

ITEM 2 - VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION STATE PLAN UPDATE:

Mr. Ainsworth reported that staff from both agencies worked diligently to get the State Plan submitted to the USDE before the deadline. So far the general response from the USDE has been quite favorable, with the following clarifications requested:

- Additional information has been requested for the Compliance and Accountability sections. A copy of the response to the questions asked by the USDE/OVAE was distributed for review.
- More justification of the two waiver letters was requested. Staff from both agencies will meet this Friday to prepare the justification.
- We were requested to clearly tell our LEAs that upon receipt of Perkins funds, they must negotiate an MOU with their local Workforce Investment Board. The Federal government is coordinating between the Workforce Investment Act and Perkins on this issue. The US Department of Labor is developing regulations on cost allocations and is saying that the One-Stops will incur costs for its clients and depending on where they are referred to, they will then allocate the cost to that agency so the LEAs must include information on the cost allocations in the MOUs they prepare. Michael Brustein from the legal office in Washington has volunteered to come to California in July to meet with our LEAs to explain the ramifications of this issue. We are considering having Mr. Brustein here on July 11 or 12.
- One significant area that needs changes in the State Plan is in the Tech Prep section. We were told we could not use the regional configuration suggested for Tech Prep funds, but that the money must go to local consortia. Some of the funds can be given competitively to the consortia to do developmental work within the sectors, but the funding set aside for regions needs to be redirected. A suggestion was made to give each local consortium a base rate and then give extra dollars to any local consortium that will agree to take the lead on other special projects.
- USDE/OVAE staff told us they did not see in our State Plan that we have notified the LEAs that they are responsible to create the MOU between themselves and One-Stops that are due July 1. Agency staff were not able to find the citation that this needed to be done, so we will contact the USDE/OVAE to get clarification on what we need to do to notify the LEAs.

Bernie Norton distributed a sheet that showed the distribution of local funds for 1999/2000. The total grant came to \$120,743,302 with \$68,340,620 for CDE and \$52,402,682 for COCCC. The handout also shows the distribution of funds between the different Titles.

Peggy Olivier clarified that the figures were for the transition year and don't reflect figures which are noted in the State Plan document. The State Plan lists the current state allocation of \$124,183,457 and accompanying distribution between agencies for administration and leadership. Distribution for local expenditure, 85% of the total grant, is also listed. Of the \$95,668,783 designated for local use, 40.65% is allocated to secondary (section 131) programs and 59.35% for postsecondary (section 132) programs. The ROC/P and adult schools are eligible for 32.63% of the postsecondary allocation with the remaining 67.67% set-aside for community colleges.

ITEM 4 - PERKINS ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Charles Parker provided a brief background on how staff assignments are made for gathering information needed for the report and how it is compiled and submitted. He then gave an overview of this year's report.

- The Introduction describes the priorities that are contained in the approved State Plan and identifies the partners involved in the delivery of those priorities.
- The report contains many charts showing such things as enrollment data and distribution of funds.
- State leadership and professional development information as completed by program areas is included.

Mr. Parker reported that the new State Plan will have new reporting requirements so staff need to discuss what to focus on in obtaining data for the next report. We need to obtain data that will support quality programs.

Comments were given as follows:

- The Annual Performance Report needs to be tied to the goals of the JAC and show the articulation between the two agencies. We need to know the criteria for the next report as soon as we can so we can plan ahead on what data to collect.
- Over the last three years we have worked to create a better data system in California. A feasibility study has been done to describe how we can collect data more efficiently, but that is not in place yet.

Peggy Olivier gave a brief description of the Annual Performance Report sections specifically covering the California Community College System and stated that the delivery is different. She suggested looking at Section II, Page 6, which provides a list of program areas for community colleges. Within the 16 Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) codes, there are approximately 340 different occupations.

Monica Lozano reviewed Table D in Section II, Page 9, (VATEA Title II-C Allocation Expenditures by Use of the Funds) and questioned the 40% figure for equipment and the low percentage for professional development. She asked if there was a way we could use the chart to focus on and possibly increase professional development. Peggy Olivier answered that VATEA funds must supplement, not supplant, other funds.

ITEM 6 - NEXT MEETING DATE:

Future JAC meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of the month. Members and staff were asked to put a hold on the following dates: July 19, September 20, November 29, and March 21. A suggestion was made to hold the meetings outside of Sacramento once a year. Staff will put together suggestions for outside meeting locations for the September or November meetings.

It was suggested that the September 20 meeting be held in Long Beach to coincide with other meetings that members will be attending. A request was made to put time on the agenda to hear from LEAs in the area about topics that are critical to the area or to showcase promising practices in area programs.

A discussion occurred again about the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and the need for approval by the JAC and both boards. Since the JAC will receive the MOU as an action item at its July 19 meeting, both agencies were asked to submit the MOU to their respective Boards as

an information item at their July meeting, and then as an action item at their next scheduled meeting. We can expedite the approval of the MOU if it is submitted simultaneously.

ITEM 3 - LEGISLATIVE UPDATE:

Patrick Ainsworth supplied a table showing different pieces of legislation that effect education and the status of each bill. He gave a quick overview of AB 2087, AB 1873, and AB 2474. Chris Yatooma spoke about SB 1790, legislation designed to reinstate the State Council on Vocational Education, and reported that both agencies opposed the bill and it has since been pulled. Monica Lozano asked why it would be necessary to form another committee. Wasn't the JAC acting appropriately? Mr. Yatooma replied that some groups felt their views were not acknowledged during the Field Review Committee meetings and were seeking another avenue to support their views. A suggestion was made that when appropriate the JAC should send letters to support/oppose pieces of legislation to show collaboration between the two state agencies.

ITEM 7 - PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comment was given.

ITEM 5 - OLD BUSINESS:

- Jerry Hayward distributed a public comment written report that was submitted by Jim Ashwanden that concerns the organization of CDE. In the new State Plan, CDE is organized around industry sectors while Mr. Ashwanden's proposal suggests keeping the current structure of individual program areas with specific career clusters within each program area. He made this presentation at the last meeting and was asked to provide a sample for further discussion at this meeting. Since Mr. Ashwanden was not able to attend this meeting, he will be asked to attend the next meeting for further discussion on his proposal.
- A reminder was given for the need to produce a document or videotape to explain the State Plan. Mr. Hayward reported that he was exploring the possibility of creating videotape or putting together a writing team to write an Executive Summary document. Staff were reminded that faculty need to be involved (such as Academic Senate) so the State Plan is implemented properly.
- A field task force needs to be put together to work on ways to collect enrollment data. Both CDE and COCCC will submit names of six people to sit on the task force. Staff will give a report on the task force at the next JAC meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Monica Lozano thanked everyone for their attendance and then adjourned the May 17, 2000 meeting of the Joint Advisory Committee on Vocational Education.